AN

IMPARTIAL REVIEW

OF THE

PRESENT GREAT QUESTION.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

AN

IMPARTIAL REVIEW

OF THE

PRESENT GREAT QUESTION.

JANUARY 3, 1789.

Great Lords, wiſe men ne'er ſit, and wail this loſs,
But chearly ſeek how to redreſs their harms.
What tho' the MAST be now blown overboard,
The *cable* broke, our holding *anchor* loſt?
Yet lives our PILOT ſtill: Is't meet, that he
Should *leave the helm*, and, like a fearful lad,
With tearful eyes add water to the ſea,
While, in his moan, the *ſhip ſplits on the rock*,
Which induſtry and courage might have ſaved?

SHAKESPEARE, 3d Part of Henry VI.

LONDON:

Printed for J. DEBRETT, oppoſite BURLINGTON HOUSE,
PICCADILLY.

M, DCC, LXXXIX.

Bi 2027.89.5126

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
MAY, 28, 1913
SUBSCRIPTION FOR
ENGLISH HISTORICAL TRACTS

AN

IMPARTIAL REVIEW,

&c. &c.

IN the conteſts of ambition, and ſtruggles of political parties, the mind becomes heated, the paſſions inflamed, and reaſon overpowered by tumult and agitation.—The man of the greateſt firmneſs is ſcarce proof againſt the torrent of prejudice, and the man of the greateſt wiſdom generally finds it eaſier to follow the tide of party than to exerciſe his own faculties in the inveſtigation of truth. A by-ſtander of a moderate capacity is, on thoſe occaſions,

more likely to form a juſt judgement on the ſubject under conſideration than much abler heads who are actors on the ſcene; and if to the advantage of ſituation he adds that of a diſpaſſionate obſerver, unconnected with either ſide, and unintereſted in the fall or riſe of either party, his opinion may be entitled to the conſideration of men of ſimilar deſcription with himſelf, whether Members of either Houſe of Parliament, or of the community at large; and to ſuch men only are the following thoughts addreſſed.

As it is my object to enable the Public to judge for themſelves on the preſent great queſtion of A REGENCY, and not to recommend any opinions of my own, I ſhall proceed to lay before them fairly, fully, and impartially, the ſtate in which that queſtion at preſent ſtands, and the proceedings already had thereon in the two Houſes of Parliament;

and

and theſe will naturally divide themſelves into three parts, ariſing from the three reſolutions already entered into by the two Houſes.

1ſt. The firſt ſtep taken by both Houſes was, a ſolemn examination of the phyſicians, and an enquiry into the actual ſtate of His Majeſty's health; and the conſequence of ſuch examination and enquiry was, an UNANIMOUS reſolution of the Lords and Commons, that His Majeſty was incapable of attending in Parliament, and of executing the duties of the Royal powers. It would be too melancholy and too affecting a taſk to diſcuſs minutely the deplorable ſtate to which it has pleaſed the All-wiſe Providence to reduce our unfortunate King; and though the anxiety of his loyal People might be gratified by the recital, humanity commands us to draw an awful veil over the diſmal ſcene. Let it ſuffice us to know

from the unanimous reſolutions of both Houſes, that His Majeſty's malady renders him totally incapable of any buſineſs: in this truth all the world are agreed, and the unanimous voice of the nation has as fully declared that the neceſſary conſequence of ſuch a ſituation was, that the defect muſt and ought to be immediately ſupplied.—A plain man unacquainted with politics has a right to aſk both Houſes of Parliament, why it has not been ſupplied; and why ſo much time has been allowed to elapſe without an *executive power* in the kingdom? And the anſwer from a Miniſter would probably be, the wiſdom of Parliament has been employed in ſearching for *precedents*, and ſettling the mode of proceeding.—A plain man would as naturally aſk—Precedents! for what? Is there any inſtance of a ſimilar ſituation to be found in the hiſtory of this kingdom? and if there be not, what can *precedents* tell you? Or is there any doubt

or

or difference of opinion among you as to the perſon who ought to be inveſted with the delegated powers of Majeſty, under the preſent circumſtances?—And his wonder would be a good deal encreaſed by being told that there is no inſtance of a ſimilar ſituation, with regard to father and ſon, to be found in the annals of Britain; and that there does not exiſt the ſlighteſt doubt or difference of opinion as to the perſon who *ought* and who *is* to be entruſted with the office of REGENT: indeed, if ever there was a queſtion where the unanimous conſent of both Houſes of Parliament accorded with the voice of the Nation, it is, to uſe the words of Mr. Pitt, *that His Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales is the onely perſon in the kingdom who can and ought to be ſole Regent.* Under ſuch circumſtances, who would not have naturally imagined that the Prince of Wales ought immediately to have been declared REGENT? but he who eaſily concludes

cludes that, becauſe the Prince ought, he therefore would be immediately declared Regent, knows little of the daring views of ambition, the violence of faction, and malevolence of party, that rage where the ſecurity of the ſtate and proſperity of the kingdom ought to be the ruling motives. The moſt perfect unanimity prevails as to theſe two great objects, *the deplorable incapacity of the King*, and *the abſolute certainty of the appointment of the Prince, his ſon, to adminiſter the government in his ſtead.* On theſe two great objects all the world are agreed, nor would the Public bear a doubt. To what motives ſhall we then attribute the alarming delay and the furious debates that have agitated both Houſes about the inſignificant mode of rendering the government complete? Shall the Public, and they have a RIGHT to demand of both Houſes of Parliament, attribute their delays and diſſentions to their regard for the wellfare of the State, or to

the

the meaner views of private intereſt? to the enlightened caution of upright ſenators, or to the infamous traffic of mercenary and venal Placemen? to the influence of the guardian angel of Britain watching over the liberty, dignity, and happineſs of the realm; or of the inſatiable demon of ambition grappling the pillars of the Conſtitution, and ſcattering the baleful ſeeds of diſcord and ſedition over a divided and ill-fated land? — Let every honeſt man lay his hand on his breaſt and anſwer the above queſtions, while I proceed with the ſame impartial integrity to the ſecond part of the ſubject: unbiaſſed by faction, uninfluenced by party, I may, probably, be condemned by both for daring to ſpeak the truth; but I defy the warmeſt partiſan of either to charge me with falſehood, or to convict me of miſrepreſentation.

2d. To throw a barrel to the whale has become proverbial to illuſtrate the trick of a Mini-

a Miniſter, who, when he has a deep deſign againſt the Conſtitution or intereſt of the State, begins by throwing out an object artfully calculated to draw off the attention of the Public from the buſineſs he has in hand; and if the people fall into the ſnare, and are ſurpriſed into hunting after the cry, the Miniſter ſecurely ſeizes his prey, and triumphs in the ſucceſs with which he has impoſed on their eaſy credulity.

Attempts having been lately made to raiſe a clamour on the ſubject of the ſecond reſolution, it becomes us, as honeſt men, to view the ſubject without prejudice, and impartially to decide, whether this clamour originates from a fair conſtitutional jealouſy, or from the violent efforts of an ambitious and enterpriſing faction.—Mr. Fox had, in a looſe debate, given it as his opinion, that the Prince of Wales, being of full age, had, as heir apparent

apparent to the Crown, a right to be appointed Regent of the kingdom, during the King's incapacity, and in the King's name: *but that he could not enter on the exerciſe of that right without the expreſs conſent, declaration, and authority of the two Houſes of Parliament.* By this proviſo, the rights, powers, and privileges of Parliament are as effectually ſecured, as by any ſpecific reſolution whatſoever: the exerciſe of the Prince's right, whatever it may be, being rendered dependent on the conſent, declaration, and authority of that reſpectable body.—Mr. Pitt affirmed, on the other hand, that the Prince had no more right to be Regent than he, or any other ſubject in the kingdom; but declares, *that His Royal Highneſs is the only perſon in the kingdom who can and ought to be choſen ſole Regent.* Mr. Pitt may be aſked, how he reconciles the Prince's having *no more right than he*, with the Prince's being the only perſon in the kingdom who can and ought

to be choſen Regent; for if the Prince has no right, why ſhould he be the only perſon in the kingdom who can be appointed Regent?

But without entering into a minute diſcuſſion of the meaning, and various applications of the word RIGHT, I will appeal to every fair and diſpaſſionate man, if the difference between theſe two gentlemen does not conſiſt more in the terms of the expreſſion, and the doubtful acceptation of the word RIGHT, than in any difference of opinion either as to the title of the Prince or the authority of Parliament—If the word RIGHT is to be underſtood as a technical term, ſtrictly originating from an Act of Parliament, I perfectly agree with Mr. Pitt, that the Prince of Wales has no more RIGHT to the Regency than he has—But if the word RIGHT be taken in its more general and unconfined acceptation, then both Mr. Pitt and all the world agree with

with Mr. Fox that the Prince of Wales has ſo undoubted a right to the Regency, that he alone can and ought to be Regent. Such logical diſtinctions and unſubſtantial forms may ſerve to occupy the frothy declaimer, or the wrangling barriſter; but are unworthy of the attention of the cool and diſpaſſionate public, who look with anxious expectation to the Houſes of Parliament to diſcharge their duty by ſupplying the deficiency in the government of the kingdom, and nominating a Regent inſtead of waſting their time and gratifying their reſentments in perſonal wrangling and verboſe argumentation.

Mr. Fox's declaration as well as Mr. Pitt's had been made in the courſe of debate on another ſubject; but Mr. Pitt thought proper to bring the queſtion of RIGHT more immediately before the Houſe in the form of a reſolution.—Mr. Fox thought the diſcuſſion unneceſſary, and tending to

delay the main buſineſs by miſleading the Houſe into a field of endleſs intricacies; inſtead of purſuing the plain road that lay before them, and urged that the declaration he recommended to them to make, of the Prince of Wales as Regent, was as full and ample an acknowledgement of their power as the voting of any abſtract propoſition whatſoever could be. And what honeſt and impartial man in the kingdom does not now approve of Mr. Fox's propoſition of putting a period to the preſent ſuſpenſion of the executive power, by nominating a Regent? the only act to which the two Houſes, in the preſent form of convention, are competent, and which act would have at once put an end to all the diſtraction and confuſion that muſt neceſſarily reſult from a different mode of proceeding, as the Legiſlature would then have been rendered complete, and the Parliament might have been immediately opened, and have proceeded to buſineſs.

3d. I ſhall now proceed to the third part of my ſubject, founded on the third reſolution—When the two Houſes had reſolved that they alone were competent to ſupply the defect of the executive branch, one ſhould have naturally concluded that no further difficulty remained, and that the next ſtep would have been to have put a period to the preſent Interregnum, by transferring the executive power into the hands deſtined to receive it.—Such a mode of proceeding might have beſt ſuited the public exigence of the ſtate, with which it would be happy for us if the private ambition of individuals were not too frequently at variance. The competency of the two Houſes being perfectly aſcertained by the ſecond reſolution, a difficulty was ſtarted about the manner of exerciſing that right.—Mr. Fox contended that the two Houſes could act only by votes, reſolutions, and addreſſes—and that in the preſent incapacity of the King, it was not poſſible to give their proceedings

ceedings the form of law, until they had ſupplied the defect by creating a Regent. —Mr. Pitt contended, on the other hand, that a law could alone be binding on the Regent, that previous to putting the power into the hands of the Regent, ſuch reſtrictions and limitations as the Houſe might deem neceſſary ought to be enacted, and that for this purpoſe the royal authority ought to be *put into commiſſion.*

Mr. Fox reprobated ſuch a mode of proceeding as reverting to the anarchy of the reign of Charles the Firſt, when firſt the two Houſes of Parliament, and then one of the Houſes, voted themſelves competent to enact laws, a doctrine that had been condemned as unconſtitutional by an expreſs Act of Parliament paſſed after the Reſtoration. Mr. Pitt argued that this caſe would be different, as they were to put the King's authority into commiſſion, and juſtified this meaſure by the King's name and authority

ſtill preſiding in his courts, where all buſineſs was tranſacted, though the King's incapacity was acknowledged——Mr. Fox clearly ſhewed the difference between the King preſiding in his Courts of Law, where he never preſided otherwiſe than by his judges, and where the proceedings, though in the King's name, were all regulated by the common or the ſtatute law; and in a legiſlating capacity in his high Court of Parliament, of which the firſt reſolution of both Houſes had already declared him incapable—Mr. Pitt pleaded the neceſſity of the caſe, and that the neceſſity that gave the power muſt limit the exerciſe of it.—Mr. Fox anſwered, that if the plea of neceſſity could be admitted in one inſtance to juſtify the aſſumption of the legiſlating power by the two Houſes, it would hold equally good in twenty or two thouſand caſes, and that as the two Houſes were the judges of the neceſſity, total confuſion muſt enſue, and all conſtitutional

ſecurity

ſecurity be for ever demoliſhed — All objections were however overruled, and the reſolution was carried, empowering the two Houſes of Parliament *to provide the means whereby the* ROYAL ASSENT *may be given in* PARLIAMENT *to a Regency bill.* The mode of doing which was declared to be by putting the King's authority into a commiſſion—or, in other words, forging the King's name to empower Commiſſioners to act for him.

The hiſtory of the long Parliament who levied war in the King's name, and by the King's authority, againſt the King's perſon, is indeed a precedent perfectly applicable to the preſent proceeding;—Lord Hawkeſbury indeed juſtified this mode of proceeding by another precedent, well deſerving the conſideration of the public, as it ſpeaks in every part the principles of his party. It was drawn from the manner of paſſing the Regency Bill in the minority

of

of Lewis the Fifteenth of France, when that King, then an infant, held *un lit de juſtice*, a bed of juſtice, at Paris, at which he preſided in his nurſe's arms, made a ſpeech to his Parliament by his Chancellor, and gave his *Royal Aſſent* to the Act of Regency—but, whether by his Chancellor or his nurſe, the noble Lord forgot tell to us.

But even admitting, as fully as the noble Lord could deſire, the ſimilarity of our Parliament to the Parliament of Paris, and the power of our King to that of the French Monarch; in order to render his parallel complete, it would be requiſite to produce the King in Parliament; for even in the abſolute monarchy of France, the perſonal preſence of the King, tho' an infant in his nurſe's arms, was deemed requiſite to give validity to the fiction of Royal Aſſent; whereas our Parliament take on themſelves to declare the King preſent, as well as to

give the *Royal Aſſent* to a bill, in the name of the KING, whom the two Houſes have declared incapable of acting.

But if we compare this laſt reſolution with the two former, we ſhall find it fraught with ſuch monſtrous abſurdity and contradiction as muſt aſtoniſh the moſt indifferent obſerver—In the firſt reſolution the King is declared incapable of appearing in Parliament, or of executing any of the royal powers. In the laſt he is to be rendered capable of giving the *Royal Aſſent, in Parliament* to a bill—In the ſecond reſolution it is declared to be the RIGHT and DUTY of the two Houſes to ſupply the defect of the royal authority—and by the laſt this RIGHT is at leaſt ſhared with a third power, by what name to call it I am totally at a loſs, but an indeſcript body, phantom, or fiction of their own creating, born by their power, an aërial repreſentative of Majeſty exiſting by their authority, an air-drawn viſion vaniſhing

niſhing at their command.—And yet this Being or no Being, this King or no King, this mock Majeſty, this Parliamentary Impoſtor, is to be inveſted with the power of giving the Royal Aſſent to a Bill of Regency!

The omnipotence of Parliament has been generally allowed, but the *two Houſes* have never claimed ſuch power ſince the civil wars; and with great ſubmiſſion to the two Houſes, I humbly apprehend that they might, with equal juſtice and propriety, declare, that I am now in the Moon, that Mr. Pitt is heir apparent, and that my eſtate is the property of my Lord Chancellor, as to iſſue a commiſſion, in the name of the King, who is declared *non compos*, and then to empower that commiſſion to give the ROYAL ASSENT, in *Parliament*, to a Regency Bill.

I ſhould likewiſe beg leave to ſtate a caſe for the conſideration of the Lord Chancellor—Suppoſe a gentleman had unfortunately fallen into a ſtate of inſanity, and that he had been proved a lunatic; in due form—and that this gentleman's relations, on finding that he had not made a will, ſhould agree among themſelves, to prevent the expence of a lawſuit, or for any other good reaſons, to make a will and to get the unfortunate gentleman, in a lucid interval, to ſign it—would my Lord Chancellor admit the act of the gentleman under ſuch circumſtances to be good and valid—or would he treat his ſignature as a forgery, and the parties concerned as guilty of that crime.

It is impoſſible to foreſee events, or to know to what lengths the violence of parties may be carried—But as it is eaſy to judge in what light a future Parliament will conſider the preſent proceedings of the

two Houſes—and in what a ſituation the principal actors will ſtand, when no longer ſupported by a majority.

If ever there was a period in our hiſtory when a violent ſhock was threatened to the Conſtitution, it is at the preſent awful and intereſting moment; for in the ſupporting and keeping diſtinct the clearly-eſtabliſhed prerogatives of the three branches of the Legiſlature conſiſted the ſafety of the ſtate, the ſecurity of our property, and the protection of our perſons—But the moment that the barriers of the Conſtitution are broken down, and one or two branches of the Legiſlature uſurp on the third, it is impoſſible for the wiſeſt man to ſay where the miſchief may ſtop, or what the conſequences may be.—A door is opened for confuſion, injuſtice and anarchy, and a precedent is eſtabliſhed by which any ſort of violence or uſurpation may be juſtified—After ſo dangerous a precedent, ſhould we be

ſurpriſed

ſurpriſed to ſee a future Parliament, or rather a powerful faction in a future Parliament, arrogate to themſelves the diſpenſation of juſtice, and the diſpoſal of private property? ſhould we be ſurpiſed to ſee arbitrary fines and impriſonment inflicted for imaginary crimes—ſhould we be ſurpriſed to ſee a State Inquiſition, a Court of High Commiſſion, and a Star Chamber erected in the place of our Courts of Juſtice?-- For at what moment were there ever leſs grounds for the tyrant's plea of neceſſity? Let Mr. Pitt ſtand forward and tell an inſulted people and a degraded Prince how he preſumes to arrogate to himſelf and his colleagues the exerciſe of the Kingly power and the forgery of the great ſeal.

Mark Antony only *offered* a Crown to Cæſar, which he prudently refuſed, tho' he had conquered Rome and won it by arms; but Mr. Pitt with more daring ambition tramples on every thing ſacred in

our

our Conſtitution, and boldly ſets the Crown on his own head—It is in vain that he may ſay that he means, after a ſhort exerciſe of the Kingly power, to preſent it to the true and lawful owner. If he can exerciſe Kingly power in one inſtance, he may in a thouſand, tho' prudence may dictate to begin by a ſhort experiment.

If neceſſity can juſtify the preſent uſurpation, it can juſtify any future aſſumption of the Royal authority, whenever an ambitious Miniſter, ſupported by a mercenary faction, can prevail in Parliament—What neceſſity exiſts at this moment but the neceſſity of reſtoring the Conſtitution and of ſupplying the defect of the Third Eſtate? and can this neceſſity juſtify the violent, the factious meaſures now purſuing to overturn the Conſtitution, to wreſt the legal powers of the Crown from their true direction, and to gratify Mr. Pitt's ambition by raiſing him over the Prince

of

of Wales and over the Regent, who is to wield a wooden ſceptre, a dagger of lath, that Mr. Pitt chooſes to put into his hand?

If Mr. Pitt ſucceeds in dividing the Royal powers, and giving a portion of them only to the Prince, I aſk every man in the kingdom, in what light ſuch a mutilated power muſt appear to the rival nations of Europe? Could ſuch a Regent ſupport your intereſts abroad, or command reſpect from foreign Kings? No! they muſt deſpiſe the empty menace of ſuch a repreſentative of Majeſty, and treat his remonſtrances with deriſion—Your dominions, your fleets, your trade muſt be expoſed to the daily and immenent danger of attack; and to whom can you, in ſuch a caſe, look up for protection? not to the Regent ſurely, whom you have degraded, and who has not the power to protect himſelf from inſult. Humbled in the ſcale of Europe, deſpiſed among foreign nations.

tions, expoſed to contempt, which may moſt probably draw you into a foreign war: would the ſituation of Government at home, under ſuch a Regent, be attended with fewer dangers and inconveniences? Do you wiſh to ſee the days of York and Lancaſter, and the bloody conteſts of ferocious ambition, revived within the kingdom? Of all the curſes that ever befel an ill-fated land, a weak and diſtracted Government is the greateſt; and you are this moment on the brink of being plunged into that dreadful ſituation.

The Royal powers and prerogatives are entruſted to a King, not for his own private benefit, but for the good of the People, and to enable him to preſerve the balance of the Conſtitution: the name of King, or Regent, or Protector, are indifferent to the People; but whoever is Chief Magiſtrate for the time, muſt be poſſeſſed of all the powers annexed to that

office, or the balance is deſtroyed, and all the dangers and inconveniencies of a weak and diſtracted Government, both at home and abroad, muſt be the conſequence.

I would aſk any honeſt man, if the patronage of the Crown has been found too great during the preſent and the two laſt reigns, with Kings firmly eſtabliſhed on the throne, to carry on the buſineſs of the Nation? and what the conſequences muſt have been, if, during the miniſtry of Sir Robert Walpole for example, the two Houſes of Parliament had voted that his opponent, Mr. Pulteney, ſhould have the power and patronage over the King's Houſhold, from the Lords of the Bedchamber downwards—beſides the appointment to all places, offices, and employments, neceſſary for the managing and directing the real and perſonal property of the King? And if, in addition to the above partition of power, the two Houſes had ſhackled the

royal

royal prerogative by ſuſpending the King's power of creating Peers; I again aſk any honeſt and fair man, if the two Houſes would not have ſubverted the Conſtitution, and have deſtroyed the ſtrength, dignity, and efficacy of Government?

But if thoſe concluſions hold good in the caſe of a *King*, they muſt apply much more ſtrongly to that of a *Regent*, whoſe government muſt be naturally weaker than that of a King—If then it would be impoſſible for a King, with ſuch powers, to carry on the Government of the Country; in what a ſituation muſt it be, in the hands of a weaker and leſs efficient Chief Magiſtrate, a Regent?

If the two Houſes ſhould agree with Mr. Pitt's propoſitions for ſuſpending certain branches of the Royal Prerogative, and of ſetting up a FOURTH ESTATE, by dividing the patronage of the Crown between the

Regent and the Queen; the ſituation of the country muſt be deplorable; and I do not heſitate to ſay, that it would be much better to appoint the Queen ſole Regent, at once, and preſerve the powers and Prerogatives of the Crown entire.

The keeping of the Royal perſon ought undoubtedly to be aſſigned to the Queen; the preſervation of the Royal treaſures ſhould be effectually provided for, until it may be hereafter clearly aſcertained to whom they legally and rightfully belong. But every power and prerogative of the Crown ought to be conferred on the Regent, who is to be entruſted with the execution of the Government and the defence of the State—Thoſe powers being originally given and conſtantly continued for the good of the people, and not the private advantage of the King, in order to preſerve the internal peace of the country by ſuppreſſing faction, and the daring cabals of a

power-

powerful party; and to give dignity and efficiency to the Chief Magiſtrate in his tranſactions with foreign potentates, and rival Kings.

Whether the two Houſes of Parliament be competent to parcel out certain powers of the Crown at their own diſcretion, and as may ſuit their own private advantage, and abſolutely to ſuſpend others, will be univerſally admitted to be a ſubject of no ſmall doubt: and if the two Houſes be competent to ſuch acts, it is then well deſerving the ſerious conſideration of every well-meaning man, to what purpoſes the precedents furniſhed by the preſent proceedings may not be applied.

It is full time that a period were put to the unſettled and diſtracted ſtate of the country. It is now almoſt two months and a half ſince His Majeſty's incapacity could be no longer concealed; during which

time

time Mr. Pitt and his colleagues have held the reins of the executive Government for their own private emolument and advantage; and from this artful mode of proceeding, and their ſtudied arts of procraſtination, by introducing abſtract queſtions to divide and diſtract the attention of the public; they ſeem extremely reluctant to quit a ſituation of ſo unexampled pre-eminence, and from which I may venture an opinion that the voice of the nation, and the indignation of the people, will at laſt drive them with ſcorn.

But during all this period has not Mr. Pitt been ſacrificing the intereſts of the State and the public ſecurity to his own private views and the intereſts of his friends? for a total ſtop has been put to all the great national objects where the King's capacity was requiſite, both at home and abroad.

At

At home all executive government has been ſuſpended, and a total ſtop put to all public buſineſs through every department; to the great loſs and inconvenience of many individuals: but from abroad, the dangers that neceſſarily reſult from ſuch a ſtate are much more important and alarming.

From the treaties entered into laſt autumn with Pruſſia and Holland, we have the ſtrongeſt proſpect of being involved, in the ſpring, in a foreign war. The negociations now carrying on, during the intermiſſion of hoſtilities, in Poland, Ruſſia, and Germany, as well as in Pruſſia, Sweden, and Denmark, might, with the management of a reſpectable and efficient Government, directed by an able and active Miniſter, have been ſo conducted, as to ſecure the objects that Great Britain is pledged to, without embroiling us in a war. But this precious opportunity has been

been irretrievably loſt, all communication ſtopt, and the power and influence of Great Britain, at ſo important a time, entirely loſt, both to ourſelves and our allies, by Mr. Pitt's obſtinacy in retaining in his hands a power which he cannot execute for the good of the Nation.

What the conſequences of ſuch a conduct, and of ſuch a total inattention to the Public concerns may be, God only knows; but how much has that Miniſter to anſwer for, who has retained the kingdom in a ſtate of inactivity, and loſt an opportunity never to be recovered, of providing for the ſafety of the State?

Whenever a Regent ſhall be appointed, what a weight of public buſineſs awaits his entering on the Government!—three months correſpondence from the ſtates and powers I have mentioned above; without adverting to Turkey, France, and Spain, whoſe

whoſe relative ſituations with reſpect to us, as well as to the other ſtates of Europe, muſt furniſh a variety of reflections to every thinking and judicious man.

After a general ſurvey of the preſent ſtate of Europe, and the manner we ſtand connected with the different powers thereof, let every man who prefers the good of the kingdom to the factious views of any political party, declare if this be a time for Great Britain to be deprived of an executive Government; and conſider what a figure a Regent, with a diſtracted and weak Government at home, and without weignt or conſequence, is likely to make, when he comes to ſupport your intereſts againſt rival nations, and to treat with Princes of ſo different a deſcription.

The ſituation of IRELAND would alone furniſh a thouſand arguments againſt the propriety of every meaſure that the Mi-

niſter has propoſed—but prudence commands me to leave them to the ſuggeſtion of each man's mind, and though it would greatly tend to demonſtrate the unanſwerable abſurdity of a *divided Regency*, or a *weak and ineffective Government*, I ſhall rather forego the advantage I might derive from the diſcuſſion, than touch lightly on a ſubject big with matter and full of danger.

THE END.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

ON THE REGENCY,

Printed for J. DEBRETT, oppoſite Burlington Houſe, Piccadilly.

AN IMPARTIAL REVIEW of the preſent GREAT QUESTION. Price 1s.

A DIALOGUE on the REGENCY. Price 6d.

DETACHED HINTS upon the QUESTION in its preſent Poſture. Price 6d.

THOUGHTS on the preſent PROCEEDINGS in the HOUSE of COMMONS, the Second Edition, price 1s.

A SHORT VIEW of the preſent GREAT QUESTION. Price 1s.

REFLECTIONS on the FORMATION of a REGENCY, in a Letter to a Member of the Lower Houſe of Parliament, the Second Edition, price 1s.

An ADDRESS to thoſe CITIZENS, who, in their Public and Private Capacity, reſiſted the Claim of the late Houſe of Commons, to nominate the Miniſters of the Crown, the Third Edition, price 6d.

The LAW of PARLIAMENT, in the preſent Situation of Great Britain conſidered. Price 1s. 6d.

An ANSWER to the CONSIDERATIONS on the Eſtabliſhment of a Regency, the Fourth Edition, price 1s.

ARGU-

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

ARGUMENTS concerning the CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT of PARLIAMENT to appoint a REGENCY; the Second Edition, price 1s.

BRIEF DEDUCTIONS, relative to the Aid and Supply of the Executive Power, in Caſes of Infancy, Delirium, or other Incapacity of the King. Price 6d.

REPORT of the LORDS COMMITTEE appointed to examine the Phyſicians who have attended His Majeſty during his Illneſs, touching the State of His Majeſty's Health. Price 1s.

LETTERS written in HOLLAND, in September and October 1787, by Thomas Bowdler, Eſq. F. R. S. and S. A. To which is added, A Collection of Letters and other intereſting Papers, relating to the Journey of the Princeſs of Orange, in June 1787, illuſtrated with Maps of the Marches of the Pruſſian Army, and of the Country near Amſterdam. Price 5s. in Boards.

OBSERVATIONS on the LAND REVENUE of the CROWN; containing the Origin and Sources of the Land Revenue of England —Of various Acceſſions to, and Alienations of, the Crown Lands—Preſent State of the Revenue—Management of the Land Revenue—Various Meaſures and Projects concerning the Land Revenue: with an Appendix, containing ſeveral intereſting Papers on the Subject of the Land Revenue, elegantly printed in Quarto. Price 10s. 6d. in Boards.